STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

July 10, 1980

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE I-72-80

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: CENTRALIZED DELIVERY SYSTEM PROJECT - RESULTS OF COUNTY SYSTEMS SURVEY

At the end of January of this year, the above survey was forwarded to automated counties for requested response and to non-automated counties for information purposes. The singular goal of the survey was to identify data processing systems which may encompass concepts that would aid in the development of the Statewide Public Assistance Network (SPAN). This survey is not related to pilot county criteria development or selection.

We have completed our evaluation of the responses and developed a proposed list of counties that are considered as sources for on-site technical studies. The specifics of the evaluation, and the conclusions reached, are contained in the attached report which is comprised of two major sections: 1) overview and results; and 2) detailed analysis.

The survey questionnaire, analytical methods, and attached results were developed with the aid and review of the CWDA-SPAN Technical Committee subcommittee (Joe Ormond - Humboldt, Phil Bates - Fresno and Fred Gustafson - Los Angeles) and further reviewed by the full CWDA-SPAN Technical Committee chaired by Dave Echols.

Your review and comments regarding this report will be appreciated. Please inform us if you find that we have overlooked potential areas of study that may be beneficial to our goals. Pending additional information, the counties listed in the attached report will be contacted directly to develop review plans and a schedule.

If you need further information or have any concerns, please contact Tom Beyer of the SPAN Bureau at (916) 323-2413.

Your cooperation in this effort continues to be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. KELLY
Deputy Director
Centralized Delivery System

Atch.

cc: CWDA

GEN 654a (7/78)

b. January 21, 1980

Questionnaire issued to 42 automated counties for response and to remaining counties for information.

c. February 21, 1980

Scoring methods for completed questionnaires reviewed with CWDA - CDS Task Force sub-committee.

d. February - March 1980

Received 38 responses - 37 completed questionnairies and one request for non-submission.

e. March 12, 1980

Reviewed scoring and analysis status with CWDA - CDS Task Force sub-committee.

f. April 8, 1980

Reviewed preliminary results with CWDA - CDS Task Force.

2. Questionnaire Structure

The questionnaire consisted of a general description of the purpose of the survey, instructions regarding completion, and specific criteria to be considered when responding to the questions.

The questionnaire was designed to indicate the degree to which commonly performed functions are assisted, and state required reports are produced, by data processing systems. The responses also indicated the degree to which these functions and reports supported each of eight major program areas administered by county welfare departments. The system functions, state required reports, and program categories are listed below:

a. System Functions

1) Intake/Data Collection
2) Eligibility Determination/Verification
3) Certification
4) Budget Computation
5) Client Notifications
6) Benefit Delivery
7) Case Management/Tracking
8) Management Control
9) Billing and Collections
10) Central Index/Data Base
11) Fraud/Audit

Centralized Delivery System Project
Overview and Results of County Systems Survey
May 1980

A. Background

1. Purpose of the Survey

The purpose of the survey was to identify county data processing systems or sub-systems which, through further detailed study, may contain concepts which are applicable to SPAN development and operation.

2. Analysis Criteria and Constraints

The responses to the survey were methodically processed to develop a list of candidate review counties with associated specific areas of study. The results, to a large degree, were dependent upon the following guidelines:

a. Objective Comparison - The survey responses were essentially reviewed on a face-value, quantified basis. Qualitative aspects were avoided as they are more properly the subject matter of detailed, on-site appraisal.

b. Diversity of Systems - Review of a cross-section of systems is an important consideration; there are too many approaches to data processing solutions to assume that a given system is relatively better than others without benefit of direct, comparable investigation.

c. Geographical Distribution - Since SPAN will be a statewide development, and demographics could influence system and procedural needs, it may be advantageous to cover the "four corners" of California. As a corollary, reviewing clusters of counties may diminish the chances of observing a variety of approaches.

d. Practical Limitations - A valid goal of any study is to obtain the maximum amount of information with the least amount of effort and/or expense; this keeps the practical considerations of resource availability and cost-benefit trade-off in perspective. With all criteria taken into account, it was felt that a cross section of 6-10 counties would be satisfactory.

B. Summary

1. Chronological Recapitulation

a. December 1979 - January 1980

Questionnaire development including review and comments by CWDA - CDS Task Force.

b. Scoring Procedure

As the questionnaires were received, they were reviewed and a score sheet was completed for each.

Each response to a survey question was asssigned a value based on the following criteria:

Value	Criteria
1.00	Function/report is automated
.75	Function/report will be automated within one year.
Ø	Neither of the above cases apply.

b. State Required Reports

1) Program Operation and Statistical
2) Fiscal/Claiming

(a) Aid Claiming
(b) Administrative Claiming

c. Welfare Program Categories

1) Aid to Families with Dependent Children - Family Groups and Unemployed

2) Aid to Families with Dependent Children - Boarding Homes and Institutions

3) Medi-Cal Eligibility

4) Food Stamps

5) Aid for Adoption of Children

6) Adult Programs

7) Social Services

8) Child Support

3. Scoring Abstract

a. Score Sheet Design

To facilitate scoring and eventual analysis, a score sheet was constructed and consisted of:

1) A Function versus Program Matrix.

This portion was based upon the first segment of the questionnaire (System Functions). The eleven functions and eight program areas were used to form the rows and columns, respectively, of the matrix. Each question (or sub-question) number was then placed in the cell of the function-program combination which it specifically addressed. Questions which could not be associated with a specific program were placed in a "General" category column.

2) Report Category Scores

This was the count of points scored in the three sub-categories of the second section of the questionnaire (State Required Reports).

4. Analysis Overview

The majority of analysis could be likened to a "boil-down" process; in all but one set of tabulations, exclusionary routines were used to arrive at a cross section of remaining counties that would best meet the criteria for further study.

For purposes of comparative weighting, the categories of "Functions", "Program Reports" and "Aid Claiming Reports" were considered on an even par. Program (support) scores were used only as a secondary aid in finalizing the choices of candidate study counties. Responses to the "Admin. Claiming Reports" questions were treated as information-only.

Due to the fact that more than one-fourth of the survey responses were from counties that use the Welfare Case Data System, the analysis was partitioned into "Case Data" and "Non-Case Data" segments, where appropriate, and a pre-imposed limit of two to three Case Data counties was set; the limit is in proportion to the anticipated envelope of 6-10 study counties.

5. Analysis Techniques

The point totals for the four main score sheet categories, "Functions", "Program Reports", "Aid Claiming Reports" and "Admin Claiming Reports" were tabulated and rank-order lists for each category were developed. This was the only set of documents that included all counties involved in the survey.

The remainder of the analysis was based upon development and usage of index numbers that represented a combination of absolute score and relative ranking.

All point scores were converted to proportions (points scored divided by points possible) for the eleven individual functions, the two "Program" and "Aid Claiming" report categories, and the eight programs noted on the score sheet. The functions and reports were combined into one matrix, and the programs formed the basis for a second matrix. County names for the function/report and program variables were placed in cells based on the proportions; the proportions were divided into 0.1 intervals, i.e., 1.0-0.9, 0.9-0.8, 0.8-0.7, etc. These two arrays represented the absolute factor of the previously mentioned index.

The scoring process for the first questionnaire section consisted of reviewing the question, assigning a value to the response, and annotating the question number in the matrix with the applicable score; when this portion was done, row and column totals were "footed and cross-footed". The report section was then reviewed, report-by-report, and the sub-section totals entered on the score sheet.

A score sheet facsimile, illustrating the function-program cells and question numbers, and the possible point totals for each function, program and reporting category is displayed below:

CDS DP SURVEY SCORE SHEET

	P	R	O	G	R	A	M			
Function	AFDC-FG/U	AFDC-BHI	Food Stamps	Medi-Cal	Aid for Adoptions	Adult Programs	Social Services	Child Support	General	Row/Total Possible Scores
Intake/ Data Collec.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	<2>	1 3 4 5 6	12
Eligibility	9	9	9	9	9	9	9			7
Certification						10	10			2
Budget Comp	12	12	12	12	12	12	12		12c	8
Client Notifications									9b 12b 13c	3
Benefit Delivery	13	13	13	13	13	13	13		13b 13d	9
Case Mgmt/ Tracking	8 24 25	8 24 25	8 24 25	8 24 25	8 24 25	8 11 18 24 25	8 11 18 24 25	<8 24 25>	24b 24c	27
Management Control									7 24d 25b	3
Billing and Collections	15 16 17						15 16 17	<15 16 17>		6
Central Index/ Data Base	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	<23>	19(3) 20(6) 21(4) 22(7)	27
Fraud/Audit									26(3)	3
Column/Total Possible Scores	11	8	8	8	8	14	11	<9>	39	107

Program Reports	32
Aid Claiming Reports	21
Admin. Claiming Reports	14

Numbers in parenthesis in the "General" column are the possible point values of the associated questions; all other questions had a potential of one point.

The Child Support entries have been bracketed to indicate that they were not included in row (function) totals; this program was examined separately and only minimal weight was placed on the results with respect the other questionnaire categories. The reason for the exclusive treatment was that the questionnaire was not sent to District Attorneys and the responses received from welfare staff were not complete enough for unqualified comparative purposes.

Relative ranks (1,2,3, etc.) were then assigned to the counties in the above mentioned function/report and program matrices. The relative rank indicates the ranking of the county regardless of the absolute or numerical score. For instance, if a given program proportion score was 0.72 it would fall in the third numerical rank (0.8-0.7, above). However, if this was the highest scoring interval for the particular category, its relative rank would be 1; analogously, if there was a score of 0.93, nothing in the range of 0.8 to 0.9, and our 0.72 score, then 0.93 would be ranked 1 and 0.72 would be ranked 2.

The list of candidate study counties was then arrived at by:

a. Developing and comparing the combined (absolute and relative) rank indexes.

b. Considering the number of above average scores accumulated in the function/report and program matrix categories.

Independent of the quantitative scoring, counties that, to date, have been identified as having unique processes in a limited area of study were added to the list of study counties.

The analysis processes noted above are presented in expanded format in the attached "Detailed Analysis" section.

6. Results of Analysis

a. General Observations

In reviewing the results of the questionnaires some items of note evolved and they are listed below without qualification.

(1) Of the eleven functions, there appears to be a lower degree of implementation for eligibility and budget computation processes when compared to other categories.

(2) Service oriented programs, in particular Social Services and Adult Programs, are supported by data processing at a relatively lower level than are the income related programs (AFDC, Food Stamps, etc.).

(3) In the majority of counties there appeared to be an emphasis on fiscal reporting rather than program-statistical reporting.

b. Suggested Study Counties

Based upon the steps described in the prior section, the following counties have been tentatively identified for further study; the list represents a "best mix" with respect to the criteria stated at the beginning of the report. Counties noted as alternates will only be reviewed if scheduling conflicts arise with other counties, or it is felt that further study will be necessary.

Multi-Function Study Counties

Butte
Los Angeles
Mendocino
San Bernardino
Santa Clara (Case Data)*
Solano (Case Data)*
Stanislaus
Tulare (Case Data)*

Marin (Alternate)
Ventura (Alternate)

*Would be reviewed in combination(s) of Santa Clara and Tulare or Solano and Tulare with the remaining county being an alternate

Special Study Counties

(1) Monterey - cycle eligibility and payments
(2) Napa - Medi-Cal budgeting.

Centralized Delivery System Project
Detailed Analysis and Results of County Systems Survey
May 1980

This section expands upon the steps that were taken to abstract and analyze the information contained in the questionnaire responses.

1. Rank Order Lists (Figures 1, 2, 3)

The responses from the 42 questionnaires were scored and arranged in order by total points within the following categories:

- System Functions
- Program Operation/Statistical Reports
- Aid Claiming Reports
- Administrative Claiming Reports

Counties with identical point totals within any category list are sub-grouped in alphabetical order.

Figure 1

CDS DP SURVEY

FUNCTIONS

Number		Points	Number		Points
1.	Tulare	95	23.	Sacramento	39.50
2.	Santa Clara	90.50	24.	Santa Cruz	39.50
3.	Los Angeles	76.25	25.	Ventura	39
4.	Fresno	74	26.	Santa Barbara	34.75
5.	Solano	73	27.	Kern	33.75
6.	San Diego	72	28.	Kings	31.50
7.	Mendocino	68	29.	Lake	30
8.	San Bernardino	65.75	30.	Imperial	28
9.	Sonoma	65	31.	Orange	27.50
10.	San Luis Obispo	64.25	32.	Shasta	27.50
11.	Marin	61	33.	Siskiyou	16
12.	Butte	60	34.	Merced	14
13.	San Mateo	59	35.	Del Norte	11
14.	El Dorado	56.25	36.	Nevada	5
15.	Humboldt	56.25	37.	Calaveras	2
16.	Riverside	51.50	38.	Alameda	(Ltr. of Non-Submission)
17.	Stanislaus	51.25	39.	Inyo	-
18.	Monterey	48.75	40.	Placer	
19.	San Joaquin	48.75	41.	San Francisco	-
20.	Yolo	48	42.	Sutter	-
21.	Contra Costa	45			
22.	Napa	45			

Points Possible = 107 excluding Child Support

Figure 3

CDS DP SURVEY

FISCAL REPORTS

AID CLAIMING

Number		Points	Number		Points
1.	Sonoma	21	22.	Mendocino	9
2.	Solano	20	23.	Sacramento	9
3.	Contra Costa	18	24.	Yolo	9
4.	Imperial	18	25.	Humboldt	8
5.	Stanislaus	16	26.	Shasta	8
6.	El Dorado	15	27.	San Joaquin	6.25
7.	Lake	15	28.	Riverside	4
8.	Santa Cruz	15	29.	Santa Barbara	4
9.	San Luis Obispo	15	30.	Calaveras	3
10.	Santa Clara	14	31.	Del Norte	3
11.	Kings	13	32.	Kern	3
12.	Marin	13	33.	Merced	3
13.	Monterey	13	34.	Tulare	3
14.	San Mateo	13	35.	Siskiyou	2.25
15.	Ventura	13	36.	Butte	1
16.	Fresno	11.50	37.	Nevada	0
17.	Orange	11	38.	Alameda	(Ltr. of Non-Submission)
18.	San Diego	11	39.	Inyo	-
19.	Napa	10.50	40.	Placer	-
20.	Los Angeles	10	41.	San Francisco	-
21.	San Bernardino	10	42.	Sutter	-

Points Possible = 21

ADMIN CLAIMING

Number		Points
1.	San Bernardino	7.75
2.	Los Angeles	5
3.	Santa Clara	5

All other counties, 3 or fewer points; 23 counties scored zero

Points Possible = 14

CDS DP SURVEY

PROGRAM REPORTS

Number		Points	Number		Points
1.	Tulare	28	22.	Humboldt	9
2.	Santa Clara	21	23.	Imperial	9
3.	Stanislaus	18.75	24.	Lake	9
4.	San Luis Obispo	18.50	25.	Kern	8.50
5.	Solano	18.50	26.	San Mateo	6
6.	Fresno	16	27.	Siskiyou	6
7.	Sonoma	15	28.	Kings	5
8.	Contra Costa	14.75	29.	Napa	3
9.	Marin	14	30.	Sacramento	3
10.	Mendocino	13.50	31.	Yolo	3
11.	Butte	13.25	32.	Merced	2
12.	Santa Cruz	13	33.	Riverside	1
13.	Ventura	12.50	34.	Calaveras	0
14.	Los Angeles	12	35.	Del Norte	0
15.	San Joaquin	11.50	36.	Nevada	0
16.	San Bernardino	11	37.	Santa Barbara	0
17.	San Diego	11	38.	Alameda	(Ltr. of Non-Submission)
18.	Monterey	10.50	39.	Inyo	-
19.	Shasta	10	40.	Placer	-
20.	El Dorado	9.50	41.	San Francisco	-
21.	Orange	9.25	42.	Sutter	-

Points Possible = 32 excluding Child Support

SYSTEM FUNCTIONS SCORE DISTRIBUTION

Figure 4

	Intake DC	ELIG.	Certif.	Budget Comp	Client Notif.	Bene Deliv	Case Mgmt	Mgmt Control	Billing & Collec	CI/ DB	Fraud/ Audit	Prog. Repts	Aid Claim Repts.
.9	L.A. Marin St. Clara		S. Diego S.L.O. St. Clara Tulare		Fresno L.A. Mendocino Riverside S. B'dino S. Diego S.L.O. S. Mateo St. Clara St. Cruz Solano Sonoma Stanislaus Tulare Ventura	Marin S.Diego S. Joaquin S.L.O. S. Mateo St. Clara Solano	S.L.O. St. Clara Tulare	Butte C. Costa Fresno Imperial L.A. Monterey Riverside S. B'dino S.L.O. S. Mateo St. Clara St. Cruz Solano Sonoma Ventura	C. Costa St. Clara Solano Tulare	Tulare	L.A. Tulare Yolo	Tulare	Solano Sonoma
.8	Tulare		Solano		El Dorado Kern	Fresno Mendocino Orange Sacto St. Cruz Tulare Yolo	C. Costa S. Diego S. Mateo Solano Sonoma Stanislaus	Tulare		Fresno L.A. Mendocino			C. Costa Imperial
.7	Butte S. B'dino S.L.O.	S. Diego	L.A.			Butte C. Costa El Dorado Humboldt Kern St. Barbara Sonoma Stanislaus Ventura	Butte El Dorado Fresno L.A. Marin St. Cruz Ventura	Mendocino	Sacto	Butte Humboldt S. B'dino S. Diego S. Joaquin St. Clara Solano Yolo	Mendocino		El Dorado Lake S.L.O. St. Cruz Stanislaus
.6		Mendocino		Fresno Mendocino Solano Ventura	C. Costa Humboldt Napa Orange	Kings L.A. Merced Monterey Riverside S. B'dino Shasta	Humboldt Kings Lake Monterey Napa Riverside S. B'dino	El Dorado Humboldt Kings Marin S. Diego Stanislaus	S.L.O.	El Dorado Riverside S. Mateo Sonoma	Fresno Humboldt Riverside S. B'dino St. Clara	St. Clara	Kings Marin Monterey S. Mateo St. Clara Ventura

2. System Functions Score Distribution (Figure 4)

For the purposes of creating this matrix, the two major reporting categories, Program and Aid Claiming, were combined with the eleven "original" system functions. From a stand point of definition, the reporting categories can be considered analogous to management and fiscal reporting functions.

The point score for each applicable function was first converted to a proportion (points scored divided by points possible); this was done to normalize all scores for visual and arithmetical comparisions.

As a first step in narrowing down the selection process, an arbitrary score cut-off of 0.6 was used for every function, i.e. any county not scoring 60% or more of the possible points within a specific function was not placed in the distribution matrix for that function.

The vertical (proportion) divisions of the matrix, starting from the bottom are 0.60 thru 0.69, 0.70 thru 0.79, etc. Any score on a major division boundary was "rounded up" if there was any remainder past the second decimal place, i.e. 0.793 would be changed to 0.80 but 0.79 (exact) would not. The counties are listed in alphabetical order within each major grid; due to the size of the table, abbreviations have been used for many counties.

The matrix indicates that eligibility and budget computation processes may have a significantly lower degree of implementation when compared to other processes. Further, there is an appreciably lower concentration in program reporting than in fiscal reporting.

3. Program Support Score Distribution (Figure 5)

This matrix was developed using exactly the same methods that were used for the "System Functions Score Distribution".

The visual comparison of the program grids indicates there may be appreciably less data processing concentration in service related programs (Adult Programs, Social Services) than in income maintenance (AFDC, Food Stamps, et al).

4. Relative Rank Analysis - Functions (Figures 6, 7)

At this point, it was decided to split the remaining counties into sub-groups by separating the ten responding Case Data counties from the others. There were two reasons for doing this: (1) The initial cut-off left a total of thirty-three counties for further examination and the handling aspects would be cumbersome. (2) If a limit were set at 2-3 Case Data counties, it would allow county segregation into the two major groups without prejudicing the selection process; this is due to the fact that there is appreciable commonality within Case Data (and diversity is a criterion) and the 2-3 limit, relative to the desired study envelope of 6-10 counties, is in the same proportion range as the responses - 10 of 37.

The analysis in this step consisted of:

a. Transferring county names and proportion scores from the "System Functions Score Distribution" to a new county-versus-function matrix. The county names formed the vertical axis, function names remained as the horizontal axis, and the proportion scores were placed in the appropriate resulting cells.

b. Next, the relative rank of the proportion scores was observed in the "Distribution" matrix and then placed, in parentheses, next to the proportion scores in the new matrix.

   The relative rank (1,2,3...) is based on when/where a county appears in the "Distribution" matrix, regardless of the score value of the major grid. For instance, in the "Eligibility" column of Figure 4, San Diego is in the third scoring grid but is the first county to appear in the category; its relative rank, therefore, is 1. In the "Billing & Collection" column, there are four counties in the first scoring grid, none in the second and Sacramento in the third; since Sacramento is in the second grouping to occur, its relative rank is 2.

c. When all cells were completed, their attributes were summarized by county at the right side of the matrix, as indicated on the face of Figures 6 and 7. In the summarization of relative ranks, they were transformed to decimal values compatible with the proportion scores; the (1,2,3...)-(1.0,0.8,0.6...) respective relationships give slightly higher weighting to relative ranks 1 and 2, when compared to proportion (absolute) scoring.

d. When all totals and indexes were calculated, the selection process continued by eliminating counties with the lowest indexes and/or count of functions. The criteria used for exclusion were that the counties were in the lower 25%, or were appreciably below the average for the count or index.

The elimination lists are shown below for the two county groups with the appropriate indicator in parentheses after each county name:

Index Elimination

Counties Excluding Case Data (average Index 1.38)		Case Data Only (average Index 1.65)	
Humboldt	(1.17)	Fresno	(1.59)
Kings	(1.00)	San Mateo	(1.55)
Lake	(1.15)		
Merced	(1.00)		
Napa	(1.10)		
Shasta	(1.00)		

Function Count Elimination

Counties Excluding Case Data (average Count 3.9)		Case Data Only (average Count 7.5)	
Imperial	(2)	Santa Cruz	(5)
Kern	(2)	Sonoma	(6)
Orange	(2)		
Sacramento	(2)		
San Joaquin	(2)		
Santa Barbara	(1)		

PROGRAM SUPPORT SCORE DISTRIBUTION

Figure 5

	AFDC-FG/U	AFDC-BHI	Food Stamps	Medi-Cal	Aid for Adoptions	Adult Progs.	Social Services	Child Support
.9	Santa Clara	Tulare	Solano Tulare	Santa Clara Tulare				
.8	Solano Sonoma Tulare	Marin Sonoma	Fresno Mendocino San Diego Santa Clara Sonoma	Fresno		Santa Clara Tulare	Santa Clara	Los Angeles Santa Clara Tulare
.7	Contra Costa Fresno San Bernardino San Luis Obispo	Butte Fresno Los Angeles Mendocino San Bernardino San Diego Santa Clara	Butte Humboldt Los Angeles Marin Monterey San Barnardino San Luis Obispo San Mateo	Butte Los Angeles Marin Mendocino Napa San Bernardino San Diego San Luis Obispo Solano Sonoma	Butte Fresno Marin Mendocino San Diego Santa Clara Sonoma Tulare		San Diego San Luis Obispo Tulare	Kings Stanislaus
	Marin Mendocino Sacramento San Diego	El Dorado Humboldt Lake Monterey Napa Riverside San Luis Obispo San Mateo Solano Stanislaus	Contra Costa El Dorado Riverside Santa Cruz Stanislaus Ventura	El Dorado Humboldt Monterey Riverside San Mateo Stanislaus	Contra Costa El Dorado Lake Monterey Napa San Bernardino San Luis Obispo San Mateo Solano Stanislaus	San Diego Solano	San Joaquin	Del Norte Fresno Marin San Mateo Solano

System Function Relative Rank Analysis
(Excluding Case Data Counties)

Figure 6

	Intake/DC	Elig.	Certif.	Budget	Notifs.	Ben. Deliv.	Case Mgmt.	Mgmt. Ctl.	Bill & Collec.	CI/DB	Fraud/Audit	Prog. Repts.	Aid Claim Repts.	(1) Count	(2) Prop. Sums	(3) Rel. Rank Sums	(2+3)/(1) Index
Butte	.7(3)					.7(3)	.7(3)	.9(1)		.7(3)				5	3.7	3.4	1.42
El Dorado					.8(2)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.6(4)		.6(4)			.7(3)	6	4.1	3.4	1.25
Humboldt					.6(3)	.7(3)	.6(4)	.6(4)		.7(3)	.6(3)			6	3.8	3.2	1.17
Imperial								.9(1)					.8(2)	2	1.7	1.8	1.75
Kern					.8(2)	.7(3)								2	1.5	1.4	1.45
Kings						.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(4)					.6(4)	4	2.4	1.6	1.00
Lake							.6(4)						.7(3)	2	1.3	1.0	1.15
Los Angeles	.9(1)		.7(3)		.9(1)	.6(4)	.7(3)	.9(1)		.8(2)	.9(1)			8	6.4	6.4	1.60
Marin	.9(1)					.9(1)	.7(3)	.6(4)					.6(4)	5	3.7	3.4	1.42
Merced						.6(4)								1	0.6	0.4	1.00
Monterey						.6(4)	.6(4)	.9(1)					.6(4)	4	2.7	2.2	1.22
Mendocino		.6(2)		.6(1)	.9(1)	.8(2)		.7(3)		.8(2)	.7(2)			7	5.1	5.8	1.56
Napa					.6(3)		.6(4)							2	1.2	1.0	1.10
Orange					.6(3)	.8(2)								2	1.4	1.4	1.40
Riverside					.9(1)	.6(4)	.6(4)	.9(1)		.6(4)	.6(3)			6	4.2	3.8	1.33
Sacramento						.8(2)			.7(2)					2	1.5	1.6	1.55
San Bernardino	.7(3)				.9(1)	.6(4)	.6(4)	.9(1)		.7(3)	.6(3)			7	5.0	4.6	1.37
San Joaquin						.9(1)				.7(3)				2	1.6	1.6	1.60
Santa Barbara						.7(3)								1	0.7	0.6	1.30
Shasta						.6(4)								1	0.6	0.4	1.00
Stanislaus					.9(1)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.6(4)					.7(3)	5	3.7	3.4	1.42
Ventura				.6(1)	.9(1)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.9(1)					.6(4)	6	4.4	4.6	1.50
Yolo						.8(2)				.7(3)	.9(1)			3	2.4	2.4	1.60
Total Counties = 23														89	63.7	59.2	1.38

NOTES

1. Each cell contains proportion score and relative rank in parentheses
2. Totals: (1) = count of cells (2) = sum of proportion scores from each cell
   (3) = sum of relative ranks, converted to decimal (1 = 1.0, 2 = 0.8, 3 = 0.6 and 4 = 0.4) from each cell.

Figure 7

System Function Relative Rank Analysis
(Case Data Counties)

	Intake/DC	Elig.	Certif.	Budget	Notifs.	Ben. Deliv.	Case Mgmt.	Mgmt.Ctl.	Bill & Collec	CI/DB	Fraud/Audit	Prog. Repts.	Aid Claim Repts.	(1) Count	(2) Prop. Sums	(3) Rel Rank Sums	(2+3)/(1) Index
Contra Costa	.9(1)				.6(3)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.9(1)	.9(1)				.8(2)	7	5.6	5.8	1.63
Fresno				.6(1)	.9(1)	.8(2)	.7(3)	.9(1)		.8(2)	.6(3)			7	5.3	5.8	1.59
San Diego		.7(1)	.9(1)		.9(1)	.9(1)	.8(2)	.6(4)		.7(3)				7	5.5	5.8	1.61
San Luis Obispo	.7(3)		.9(1)		.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.6(3)				.7(3)	8	6.5	6.8	1.66
San Mateo					.9(1)	.9(1)	.8(2)	.9(1)		.6(4)			.6(4)	6	4.7	4.6	1.55
Santa Clara			.9(1)		.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.7(3)	.6(3)	.6(2)	.6(4)	10	7.9	8.4	1.63
Santa Cruz					.9(1)	.8(2)	.7(3)	.9(1)					.7(3)	5	4.0	4.0	1.60
Solano			.8(2)	.6(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.8(2)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.7(3)			.9(1)	9	7.4	8.2	1.73
Sonoma					.9(1)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.9(1)		.6(4)			.9(1)	6	4.8	4.8	1.60
Tulare	.8(2)		.9(1)		.9(1)	.8(2)	.9(1)	.8(2)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)		10	8.7	9.4	1.81
														75	60.4	63.6	1.65

Total Counties = 10

NOTES

1. Each cell contains proportion score and relative rank in parentheses
2. Totals: (1) = count of cells (2) = sum of proportion scores from each cell
   (3) = sum of relative ranks, converted to decimal (1 = 1.0, 2 = 0.8, 3 = 0.6 and 4 = 0.4) from each cell.

5. Relative Rank Analysis - Program Support (Figures 8,9)

This step was identical to the functions relative rank analysis except for the following:

a. The source matrix was the "Program Support Score Distribution"

b. The analysis processes were done only for the counties that remained after the prior step's index and function count elimination.

c. There was no elimination within this process; its only purpose was to develop program indicators to be used in conjunction with the function indicators.

Program Support Relative Rank Analysis

(Case Data Counties)

	AFDC-FG/U	AFDC-BHI	FOOD STAMPS	MEDI-CAL	AID FOR ADOPTIONS	ADULT PROGRAMS	SOCIAL SERVICES	CHILD* SUPPORT	(1) Count	(2) Prop. Sums	(3) Rel. Rank Sums	(2+3) (1) Index
Contra Costa	.7(3)		.6(4)		.6(2)				3	1.9	1.8	1.23
San Diego	.6(4)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.7(3)	.7(1)	.6(2)	.7(2)		7	4.8	5.2	1.43
San Luis Obispo	.7(3)	.6(4)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.6(2)		.7(2)		6	4.0	3.8	1.30
Santa Clara	.9(1)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.9(1)	.7(1)	.8(1)	.8(1)	.8(1)	7	5.6	6.4	1.71
Solano	.8(2)	.6(4)	.9(1)	.7(3)	.6(2)	.6(2)		.6(3)	6	4.2	4.4	1.43
Tulare	.8(2)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.9(1)	.7(1)	.8(1)	.7(2)	.8(1)	7	5.7	6.6	1.76
Total Counties = 6									36	26.2	28.2	1.51

*Not included in scoring totals

NOTES

1. Each cell contains proportion score and relative rank in parentheses
2. Totals: (1) = count of cells (2) = sum of proportion scores from each cell
   (3) = sum of relative ranks, converted to decimal (1 = 1.0, 2 = 0.8, 3 = 0.6 and 4 = 0.4) from each cell.

Figure 8

Program Support Relative Rank Analysis

(Excluding Case Data Counties)

	AFDC-FG/U	AFDC-BHI	FOOD STAMPS	MEDI-CAL	AID FOR ADOPTIONS	ADULT PROGRAMS	SOCIAL SERVICES	CHILD* SUPPORT	(1) COUNT	(2) PROP. SUMS	(3) REL. RANK SUMS	(2+3)/(1) INDEX
Butte		.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(1)				4	2.8	2.8	1.40
El Dorado		.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(2)				4	2.4	2.0	1.10
Los Angeles		.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(3)				.8(1)	3	2.1	1.8	1.30
Marin	.6(4)	.8(2)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(1)			.6(3)	5	3.5	3.4	1.38
Mendocino	.6(4)	.7(3)	.8(2)	.7(3)	.7(1)				5	3.5	3.4	1.38
Monterey		.6(4)	.7(3)	.6(4)	.6(2)				4	2.5	2.2	1.18
Riverside		.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(4)					3	1.8	1.2	1.00
San Bernardino	.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.7(3)	.6(2)				5	3.4	3.2	1.32
Stanislaus		.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(4)	.6(2)			.7(2)	4	2.4	2.0	1.10
Ventura		.6(4)	.6(4)		.6(2)				3	1.8	1.6	1.13
Total Counties = 10									40	26.2	23.6	1.24

*Not included in scoring totals

NOTES

1. Each cell contains proportion score and relative rank in parentheses
2. Totals: (1) = count of cells (2) = sum of proportion scores from each cell
   (3) = sum of relative ranks, converted to decimal (1 = 1.0, 2 = 0.8, 3 = 0.6 and 4 = 0.4) from each cell.

Candidate County Selection
(Excluding Case Data)

County	Functions Count	Functions Index	Programs Count	Programs Index	Selection/Discussion
Los Angeles	8	1.60	3	1.30	Select - very high in function scoring; program support count low but index adequate.
Mendocino	7	1.56	5	1.38	Select both counties - good to high scoring in both functions and program support.
San Bernardino	7	1.37	5	1.32	
El Dorado	6	1.25	4	1.10	Delete El Dorado - low in both functions and program support indexes.
Riverside	6	1.33	3	1.00	Delete Riverside - Adequate in functions but low in both program support count and index.
Ventura	6	1.50	3	1.13	Select Ventura as an alternate - geographical considerations and marginal program support scoring.
Butte	5	1.42	4	1.40	Select Butte and make Marin an alternate - both score well, however, Butte is a central processing county, i.e. similarities to CDS concepts.
Marin	5	1.42	5	1.38	
Stanislaus	5	1.42	4	1.10	Select Stanislaus - program support would be higher with Child Support inclusion and central valley representation needed.
Monterey	4	1.22	4	1.18	Delete - marginal in both functions and program support indexes and counts.

6. Candidate County Selection (Figures 10, 11)

The two county groups were arrayed with their count and index indicators for the function and program variables; the lists were constructed by ranks based on function count.

The final selection step was to evaluate all the indicators within and between the rank-order groups. The order of importance of the indicators was considered to be function index, function count, program index, and program count.

The selection-elimination aspects, at this point, became difficult, especially in the central rankings. A key to differentiating between counties that were effectively "tied" was to consider geographical distribution. The resulting choices, which are grouped in Figure 12, essentially cover the northern, central and southern, coastal and interior regions of the state.

Candidate County Selection
(Excluding Case Data) - **continued**

County	Functions Count	Functions Index	Programs Count	Programs Index	Selection/Discussion
Yolo	3	1.60	0	---	Delete - low on function count and no program support entries.

Figure 11

Candidate County Selection
(Case Data)

County	Functions Count	Functions Index	Programs Count	Programs Index	Selection/Discussion
Santa Clara	10	1.63	7	1.71	Select Santa Clara and Tulare – both are very high in support count and indexes; Tulare is much higher than all other counties in functions index.
Tulare	10	1.81	7	1.76	
Solano	9	1.73	6	1.43	Select Solano as a third choice - very high in functions count and index; same or better as remaining counties in program support.
San Luis Obispo	8	1.66	6	1.30	
Contra Costa	7	1.63	3	1.23	
San Diego	7	1.61	7	1.43	Either pair of Tulare - Santa Clara or Tulare - Solano are good combinations regarding geographical distribution.

Figure 12

Proposed County Study Matrix

Counties (Excluding Case Data)	Functions: Intake/DC	Elig.	Certif.	Budget	Notifs.	Ben. Deliv	Case Mgmt	Mgmt. Ctl.	Bill&Collec	CI/DB	Fraud/ Audit	Program Reports	Aid Claim Reports	Programs: FG/U	BHI	Food Stamps	Medi-Cal	Aid for Adoptions	Adult Programs	Social Services	Child Support
Butte	X					X	X	X		X					X	X	X	X			
Los Angeles	X		X		X		X	X		X	X				X	X	X				X
Mendocino		X		X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X			
San Bernardino	X				X			X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X			
Stanislaus					X	X	X						X		X	X	X	X			X
Case Data Counties																					
Santa Clara*			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Solano*			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Tulare	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Alternate Counties																					
Marin	X					X	X							X	X	X	X	X			X
Ventura				X	X	X	X	X							X	X		X			

*Either Santa Clara or Solano will be used in conjunction with Tulare and the remaining county will become an alternate.

7. Proposed County Study Matrix (Figure 12)

This is a recapitulation of the selected counties and their relative rankings. The "Functions" side contains an 'X' for any ranking of 1,2, or 3 and the "Programs" side is for any ranking, 1 through 4. Loosely interpreted, the chart indicates the system functions to be reviewed with possible concentration in, or relationship to, specific programs.

The potential weak points (or strong points) are indicated by the 'Xs' in any particular column. Where there isn't an 'X' in each of the first two county groupings it may result in a lack of diversity in specific review areas.

8. Special Areas of Study

All of the prior analysis was a "bulk process" and, inherently, may have disregard uniqueness of operation on a limited scale. To insure that potentially beneficial automation concepts are not overlooked, studies of a more restricted scope, covering one or two functions, may be performed in additional counties. To date, two such counties have been identified:

Monterey - cycle eligibility and payments
Napa - Medi-Cal budgeting